DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 240 JC 910 488

AUTHOR	Fadale, LaVerna M.; Winter, Gene M.
TITLE	Professional Development Dialogue and Information Meeting: Coordinators and Selected Administrators/Staff for Learning Disabled Students. Summary Proceedings (Albany, New York, May 29-30, 1991).
INSTITUTION	State Univ. of New York, Albany. Two Year Coll. Development Center.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Grants Administration.
PUB DATE	May 91
NOTE	33p.; Project supported by funds from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (VEA 152-91-1853).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Compliance (Legal); *Educational Diagnosis; *Educational Legislation; *Learning Disabilities; Predictive Validity; Professional Development; *School Law; Standardized Tests; Student Evaluation; Test Validity; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

In May 1991, a professional development conference was held for coordinators of services for learning disabled (LD) students in New York State two-year colleges. The purpose of the session was to provide an opportunity for information and dialogue targeted at the exchange of ideas and perspectives and the consideration of regional and local coordination. Three main themes served as the focus of the conference: (1) legislation/legal issues and implications for local college programs, including interpretation of recent legislation, regulations, management, and advocacy; waivers of required/standard courses and academic integrity; ability to benefit legislation and its implications; (2) diagnosis and transition, including diagnostic testing, evaluation and assessment activities that improve transition, and designation of secondary and postsecondary roles to facilitate transition; and (3) the use and validity of standardized tests with LD students, including limitations of standardized tests, reliability, validity, testing LD students, and social issues. Concurrent discussion groups addressed the specific topics within the major themes. Each group's facilitator also served as a resource by presenting information and responding to concerns. This report provides the conference agenda, participant lists, and summaries of discussions, information provided, and recommendations. A sample disabled student services taping agreement and a fact sheet regarding family educational rights and the Privacy Act of 1974 are attached. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337240

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

Professional Development Dialogue and Information Meeting: Coordinators and Selected Administrators/Staff for Learning Disabled Students

May 29-30, 1991
Albany, New York

by
LaVerna M. Fadale
Gene M. Winter

Two-Year College Development Center
University at Albany
State University of New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. M. Fadale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SUMMER 1991

JC 910 488

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS

Professional Development Dialogue and Information Meeting: Coordinators and Selected Administrators/Staff for Learning Disabled Students

An Activity of the Project

Serving Selected Special Populations in Postsecondary Occupational Education: Technical Assistance and Support (VEA 152-91-1853)

A product of a research and development project supported by funds from the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Educational Act administered by the Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration, New York State Education Department

AGENDA

Professional Development Dialogue and Information Meeting:
Coordinators and Selected Administrators/Staff
for Learning Disabled Students

Route 9 Holiday Inn Latham, NY

May 29-30, 1991

- -

The purpose of this session is to provide an opportunity for information and dialogue by Coordinators of programs for Learning Disabled Students and other appropriate selected staff, toward increasing understandings, exchange of ideas and perspectives, and consideration of regional/local coordination particularly as related to the targeted dimensions of legislation/legal implications to college programs and diagnosis/transition.

Day I (Room B)

12 - 1:30 p.m. Arrival, Registration, Buffet Lunch (Main Dining Room)

1:30 Welcome, Introductions and Overview

LaVerna M. Fadale, Gene M. Winter
Two-Year College Development Center, University at Albany

Michael King, Supervisor
Bureau of Postsecondary Grants Administration
New York State Education Deaprtment

Update on Spring and Ongoing Activities -

William Carpenter, Manager
Educational Institution Linkages, VESID

Nancy Lauria, Associate
Office for Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions
New York State Education Department

2:30 Topic: *Legislation/Legal Issues, Implications to Local College Programs*

Format: Facilitators/presenters serve as a panel to briefly overview or share basic information, then divide into three small groups for dialogue and discussion:

Group 1: (Room B) Issues related to interpreting recent legislation, addressing advocacy, management and regulations

Richard Hasselbach, Assistant Counsel
State University of New York

Group 2: (North Room) Issues related to waiver of required courses or standard course requirements and academic integrity: When are students otherwise qualified and with whom does the decision rest?

Facilitator/Presenter: *Thomas Kelsh, Associate Academic Program Review State Education Department*

Robert Kusek, Dean for Career Education Fulton-Montgomery Community College

Group 3: (Board Room) Issues related to ability to benefit and other testing, what are the implications, alternatives to procedures regarding Learning Disabled students and programs?

Facilitator/Presenter: *Lawrence Gray, Associate Postsecondary Grants Adminis. State Education Department*

(Break 2:15 p.m.)

4:45 - 5:00 p.m. Plenary Session: Highlights of Group Sessions

Reactors, Project Staff, Participants

6:00 DINNER (B Room)

Presenter/Discussant: Richard M. Clark, Professor Educational Psychology & Statistics University at Albany

Using Standardized Tests with Learning Disabled Students

- Do tests allow alternative testing (forms, verbal, untimed, etc.) and how/does it affect validity?
- How can analyses of testing outcomes help in development of services for Learning Disabled?

- -

Day II

7:30 - 8:30 a.m. BREAKFAST (Main Dining Room)

9:00 Topic: *Diagnosis and Transition*

Format: Panel Overview and Small Group Dialogue

Group 1: (North Room) Issues related to high school level evaluation and vocational assessment: What is most helpful to the college and how could the college work with secondary to improve transition?

Facilitator/Presenter: *Kathy Hoffman, Coordinator Erie Comm. College/South*

Group 2: (B Room) Issues related to testing and diagnosis by college staff: When is referral the best diagnosis, consideration of previously unidentified students including adults, how sure are we of our placement testing procedures?

Facilitator/Presenter: *Deborah Knight, Coordinator Onondaga Community College*

Group 3: (Board Room) Issues related to designation of roles of secondary and postsecondary in facilitating transition of Learning Disabled students: What works and how?

Facilitator/Presenter: *Sandra Arnone SETRC Representative Rensselaer-Columbia-Greene BOCES*

(Break 9:15 a.m.)

11:15 a.m. Plenary Session (B Room)

Format: General discussion drawing from session and regional efforts already underway to ascertain feasibility of possible actions. Summary and feedback as per -

a) Awareness of how others address and think about the topics

b) What else is needed to be known and/or clarify topics?

c) This is what coordinators can do; if no other help, how do we address topics?

d) Are there next steps to be taken to help facilitate coordination?

Reactors: *Pablo Negron, Coordinator Disabled Student Services Hudson Valley Community College*

Bruce Pomeroy, Coordinator Disabled Student Services Broome Community College

Project Staff: *LaVerna M. Fadale/Gene M. Winter*

12:00 LUNCH and Closing (Main Dining Room)

- -

Project Ad Hoc Advisory Committee:

Kathleen S. Hoffman, Erie Community College, South
Deborah Knight, Onondaga Community College
Pablo Negron, Hudson Valley Community College
Bruce Pomeroy, Broome Community College
Nancy Lauria, New York State Education Department

PARTICIPANT LIST

Professional Development Dialogue and Information Meeting:
Coordinators and Selected Administrators/Staff
for Learning Disabled Students

Route 9 Holiday Inn Latham, NY

May 29-30, 1991

- -

Borough of Manhattan Community College

Mary S. Padula

Cazenovia College

Faith Cobb

Columbia-Greene Community College

June Blake
Christine Cathren

Community College of the Finger Lakes

Patricia Hutchinson
Patricia A. Malinowski

Corning Community College

Deborah Cruise
Richard Ek

Fulton-Montgomery Community College

Cathy Brucker
Harold R. Morrell

Herkimer County Community College

Marjorie Moore
Michele Weaver

Erie Community College/South

Nancy Bailey

Hudson Valley Community College

Mary A. Blake
Todd M. Wysocki

Jamestown Community College, Cattaraugus County Campus

Janet Medina

Medgar Evers College

Eda F. Harris-Hastick

Mohawk Valley Community College

Lynn Igoe Holland

Monroe Community College

Ramona Moore
Valerie Pagano

Nassau Community College

Barbara Finder
Janis Schimsky

New York State Education Department, VESID

Ingo Gloeckner

Niagara County Community College

Karen A. Drilling
Lydia Ulatowski

Onondaga Community College

Roger Purdy
John Starkweather

Orange County Community College

Marilynn Brake
Herbert Cohen

Paul Smith's College

Roxanne McCarty
Carol McKillip
Neil Surprenant

Schenectady County Community College

Mary Jane Dike
Gail Williams

Seton School of Iona College

Elsa Brady DeVita
Antonia Phillips

State University of New York Central Administration

Caroline Forsberg

State University College of Agriculture and Technology, Cobleskill

Ann Campbell
Kathy Johnson

State University College of Technology, Alfred

Kathryn Fosegan
Jeanne Mead

State University College of Technology, Delhi

Ellen D'Acquisto

Suffolk County Community College

Elmira L. Johnson, Ammerman Campus

Sullivan County Community College

Ellen Galligan
Sari Rosenheck-Gaiman

Tompkins-Cortland Community College

Jim Hull
Walter Poland

Villa Maria College

Bonnie Clark
Sister Mary Carol Piskor

Program Presenters/Facilitators/Reactors

Sandra Arnone, Rensselaer-Columbia-Greene BOCES, SETRC
William Carpenter, Educational Institution Linkages, VESID
Richard M. Clark, University at Albany
Lawrence Gray, New York State Education Department
Richard Hasselbach, State University of New York
Kathy Hoffman, Erie Community College/South
Thomas Kelsh, New York State Education Department
Michael King, New York State Education Department
Deborah Knight, Onondaga Community College
Robert Kusek, Fulton-Montgomery Community College
Nancy Lauria, New York State Education Department
Pablo Negron, Hudson Valley Community College
Bruce Pomeroy, Broome Community College

Project Staff

LaVerna M. Fadale, Project Director
Gene M. Winter, Center Director
Two-Year College Development Center
University at Albany

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Topic: Legislation/Legal Issues and Implications to Local College Programs	2
A. Interpretation of recent legislation; regulations, management and advocacy	2
B. Waiver of required/standard courses and academic integrity; when are students otherwise qualified and with whom does the decision rest?	5
C. Ability to benefit (ATB) legislation and its implications	6
Topic: Diagnosis and Transition	9
A. Diagnosis and Testing	9
B. In terms of evaluation and assessment, what is most helpful to the college and how to best work with secondary levels to improve transition?	12
C. Designation of secondary and postsecondary roles and workable strategies in facilitating transition	15
Topic: Use and Validity of Standardized Tests with Learning Disabled Students	18
A. Standardized testing provides information on one of two types of performance	18
B. Reliability	18
C. Validity	18
D. Testing Learning Disabled Students	18
F. Social issue	18
General Requests to State Level Agencies	19
Appendix A - Disabled Student Services Taping Agreement	20
Appendix B - Fact Sheet - Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974	21

INTRODUCTION

On May 29-30, 1991, a professional development conference was held for coordinators of services for learning disabled students in New York State two-year colleges. The purpose of the session was to provide an opportunity for information and dialogue targeted at exchange of ideas and perspectives, and consideration of regional/local coordination. Two broad areas were the foci of discussion: 1) implications of legislation/legal issues to local programs, and 2) diagnosis and transition. The primary format consisted of concurrent discussion groups with a specified focus within the major topics. Each group had a facilitator who also served as a resource to the group by presenting information and responding to concerns. In addition, reactors summarized discussions pointing out major concerns and recommendations made within the group.

The conference was attended by more than 70 professionals. The agenda of the event and its participant list are included for clarity of procedure, identification of resource personnel, and encouraging contact or networking. Summaries of discussions and recommendations comprise the body of the document.

We hope the proceedings will be useful to local and statewide efforts and facilitate productive networking and coordination among coordinators statewide.

Dr. LaVerna M. Fadale
Project Director

(518) 442-5590

TOPIC: LEGISLATION/LEGAL ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS TO LOCAL COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Facilitator: Richard Hasselback
Assistant Counsel
State University of New York

A. Interpretation of recent legislation; regulations, management and advocacy

Discussion of Issues

The following concerns and issues were raised by participants in regard to Section 504 and ADA.

1. Who and what offices on campus should have access to information on students with disabilities? According to the Buckley Amendment, any educational records that are identifiable to a student cannot be disclosed to a third party unless consent from that individual (student) is obtained. However, there are exceptions to the general rule under certain circumstances:

   a. legitimate educational information to school officials

   b. disclosure of information to another educational institution, i.e., admission to another school.

   Although this information is considered confidential, other third parties at the college may have computer access to some of the information. It is essential that every institution clearly define the parameters of confidentiality as to how much information will be released, to whom, and for what purpose it will be used. For example, a disabled student does not want to be identified to any other office on campus but the computer center has access to coded information. Although such information is treated as confidential, the general information screen could be accessed and a particular code number/letter for the student would be visible. Even though a third party would not know the particular disability or what the code represents one could know that the student has a disability. How confidential is this? (See Appendix A.)

2. Some of the participants indicated that information on disabled students is kept primarily for demographic reasons and for the annual SUNY Institutional Research Statistical Report.

   Other ways of obtaining statistical data on students with disabilities:

   - college health office (except for those schools which do not have a health office)

   - the SUNY application (students have the option of identifying themselves as having a disability)

   - VESID/CBVH referrals

- College Placement Test, i.e., ASSET

3. In order to protect the institution from a 504 grievance, it was suggested that the DSS office develop a handbook for disabled students that specifically outlines what services are not provided--what is done and what cannot be done in regard to reasonable accommodations.

4. Section 504/The Rehabilitation Act of 1973

"No otherwise qualified handicapped individual...shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Any institution who received federal funding (Pell Grant) should be in compliance with Section 504.

Under 504, "reasonable accommodations" does not require an institution to provide everything that is requested by a disabled student. The institution must provide what is reasonable within the resources available. For example, a student could require 10 hours of tutorial services per week but the college can only provide 5 hours. This is still reasonable.

If a student continues to fail courses and is academically dismissed, should he or she be eligible to continue to receive support services as a part-time continuing education student? It was suggested that a part-time student policy be developed to avoid legal ramifications. Also, it was stated that a student with a disability has a right to fail just like any other student.

In regard to interpreting services, does the law require that an institution provide an interpreter if there are no interpreters in the area? Is the institution liable? It was stated that you are not denying an individual interpreting services if it is beyond the resources of that community. It was not clear as to how far and to what extent the institution has to go to obtain an interpreter. A policy needs to be specified.

A professor prohibits a student from taping lectures because of copyright laws. What other options are available under reasonable accommodations?

- notetaker
- a student who takes the notes could read them onto a tape
- the student signs an agreement with the instructor that all tapes will be returned at the end of the semester
- the student could review the tape during the instructor's office hours or an assigned time (See Appendix B.)

5. The American Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)

In reference to ADA, there was very little discussion because of its recent enactment.

Recommendations

- SUNY Central should develop a comprehensive manual on reasonable accommodations for all colleges to use as a guideline for consistency.
- Work closely with SUNY Central Legal Department or 504 person on campus in regards to questions and information on ADA and Section 504.
- Apply for a subscription of the Handicapped Requirement Handbook which focuses on court cases that might give you some guidance on how to handle a particular problem or situation on your college campus.
- Recommended consultants on Section 504 and ADA:

Bob Boehlert, Counsel for State Advocated Office
(518) 473-4129

Sim Goldman, Attorney
Capital District Center for Independence
(518) 459-6422

Pablo Negron
Reactor/Recorder

B. Waiver of required/standard courses and academic integrity; when are students otherwise qualified and with whom does the decision rest?

Facilitators: Thomas Kelsh, Associate
Academic Program Review
State Education Department
Robert Kusek, Dean for
Career Education
Fulton-Montgomery Comm. Coll.

Discussion Summary

There is a "wave" of learning disabled students in programs in public schools (4.9%), approaching 100,000 in number and many are looking to enroll in college. In order to be successful, many of these students may need waivers/substitutions of courses, most frequently in math and foreign languages. However, there are no specifics in 504 or ADA regarding curricular substitution. Examples of substitutions or allowances such as adaptive equipment are given in 504, but the legislation is difficult to interpret to curricular issues. Discussions addressed problems which include academic integrity since any substitution must be similar for a rational decision, a consistency in treating students, appropriate documentation of activities, recognition that college-wide academic requirements are difficult to document, feasibility of transfer of substitutions, and concern that math is often used to "weed out" students. If a number of accommodations are given, to what extent does academic integrity exist?

It was suggested that the act of justifying academic requirements results in stronger programs. Academic personnel working with departments and faculty should focus on student abilities, not disabilities, thereby reducing danger of prejudgments. A good neutral ground for discussion is an Advisory Committee with campus-wide input, particularly academic areas. It should be noted that general education requirements may be a political hotbed given fluctuations of perspectives.

There are emerging factors that should be noted: 1) American Sign Language (ASL) is in the process of being submitted to the Regents for approval as a language substitution when meeting the same standards as other foreign language programs. 2) VESID is looking to improve learning disabled testing and screening.

Concerns

1. The increasing numbers of learning disabled students currently in high school who may be potential college students

2. If course waivers are given, can employment and transfer requirements be met?

3. Limited resources available for use in providing services

4. Campus perception of the number of accommodations and the the conflict with principles of academic integrity

5. Employment/transfer/"real world" feeling of qualification

6. Pre-college advisement/tracking of learning disabled

7. Availability of testing for older/non-diagnosed learning disabled students

8. Language and math requirements are main concerns regarding waiver

9. The appropriateness of college for low IQ/LD students

Recommendations

1. Campus-wide input and/or advisory committees; review makes for strong policy/program

2. Use of resources from the community and other colleges

3. Better training of campus faculty/staff

4. Avoid the word "waiver," look for "alternatives"

5. Help learning disabled students explore all options

6. Use a "SYSTEM" with flexibility and documentation

7. Foreign language requirements - ASL should soon be a language language substitution; use smaller classes; take language with reduced course load

8. Help learning disabled students become better advocates for themselves, and help them understand themselves

Bruce Pomeroy
Reactor/Recorder

C. Ability to benefit (ATB) legislation and its implications

Facilitator: Larry Gray, Associate
State Education Department

Discussion of Issues

The Ability to Benefit (PL 101-508) legislation was motivated by the high rate of loan defaults at some proprietary and trade schools. As of July 1, 1991 all students who apply for Title IV aid (Pell/TAP, SEOG, GSL) must be successfully tested prior to enrollment or after admission. This may affect adult, non-native-born, in addition to 18 year old students. There seems to be an assumption that academic weakness is the basis of default. Schools may admit any individual who does not have a high school diploma or equivalent. A State Education Department ruling states that an IEP diploma is not a high school diploma; however, many transcripts do not specify IEP, so testing is not required. A technical amendment (April 10 - July 1) allows assessment through counseling and remediation, and students who are not in possession of a high school diploma or its equivalent can slip into this window prior to July 1, 1991.

Possible ATB examinations include: ACT, ABLE Level 3, (ASAT Form A & B), DAT v/w, Nelson Denny Reading Test, PSAT, SAT. Financial aid auditors check the tests that have been used. Minimum cut-off scores are defined as 1.0 full deviation below the mean.

Much of the law is open to interpretation, and in time court cases will provide meaning.[1] There is need to focus on transition of learning disabled students without a high school diploma. Many are adults, and when ATB testing, provide an accommodation for the testing even though regulations state physical disabilities need to be accommodated. Learning disabled students are being deprived of accommodations on testing for enrollment, but not after enrollment. Title IV audits will increase and statutory requirements must be met.

Recommendations

Have a process in place that has a rationale, local norms, and maintain testing records for financial aid audits.

[1]Congress reopened the "ability to benefit" discussions during June 1991, and are taking a look at three bills that would alter the status quo.

Resources

Federal Register, December 19, 1990
52-160, Volume 55
Ann Clough
202-708-4906
(Washington D.O.E. - for more information)

Larry Gray
518-474-5705
(State Education Department - for information and exchange)

Gail Williams/Gene Winter
Reactors/Recorders

TOPIC: DIAGNOSIS AND TRANSITION

Facilitator: Deborah Knight
Coordinator
Onondaga Comm. Coll.

A. Diagnosis and Testing

1. Issues and suggestions

a) How to follow through since it becomes labor intensive to follow each individual student through classes

-- Know instructors and advise students to avoid certain faculty

-- Empower students to become better self-advocates

-- Give students more role in selecting accommodations, encourage students to talk about themselves and needs

b) If student comes with an LD label but may not be, what can be done? Is there an increase in IEP diplomas because of not passing RCTs rather than because of the presence of a disability?

-- Examine consistency of results of testing and behavior

-- Examine sub-tests of WISC for clues -- arith, coding, etc.

-- Ask a lot of questions and observe continually

-- Emotionally disturbed students are often labeled L.D.

-- Tutors can be a valuable source of information to refine diagnosis. They spend more time than coordinators with students; promote tutor observations and feedback to refine diagnosis and prescription

-- Single most useful piece of evidence is a writing sample

c) How to deal with an adult who "thinks" he/she may be LD or dyslexic?

-- Try to learn and have student discover why past educational history has been deficient

-- Sometimes a full evaluation is not needed; motivation is high enough to compensate - perhaps not worth the cost

-- Often faculty will give the usual accommodations anyway

-- Student may only need counseling or proof that someone cares

d) Is it acceptable to put a student in a remedial reading course when a reader is required?

-- College might not be best place for such a person, in spite of open enrollment; advising student to seek employability training may be more beneficial

2. Patterns of Funding for Diagnosis

a) Most colleges refer out for diagnosis

-- VEA funds have supported diagnostician to help coordinator. VEA funds are commonly used for staff and services for LD students.

-- Medicaid will pay for diagnosis; physician can refer.

-- Graduate school psychology programs, if one is nearby, may offer sliding rates to the community.

-- VESID can only use a licensed psychologist, but a good school psychologist may be better in terms of learning -- regulations need examination; VESID task force is looking at this. VESID will make a significant difference in person's employability.

-- A local school psychologist may do a test (IEP), 1 consultation for $100.

-- Local health insurance plans may cover some services.

-- Catholic charities may have a staff member that allows acceptance of Medicaid.

-- Coordinator may give Woodcock-Johnson - no licensure required.

-- V.A. will fund diagnosis for veterans.

-- Some funds may be available for diagnosis at come colleges.

3. Transition

a) Building local power/influence base for support of program

-- Community groups, faculty/staff, parents of LD children

-- Find a niche -- unite with 504 committee and/or dean of student services.

-- Find where decisions are made and present the case.

-- Empower students to tell their stories, work at Public Relations and information spreading.

-- Development office - brochures, inservice programs

-- Don't grow too fast.

b) Ideas for orientation programs

-- Teach, role-play, involve faculty

-- Work at having staff get to know students and each other early

-- Observing students in a classroom setting assists in diagnosis

c) Working with parents

-- Need to work with parents in some way since they are still the main support system; need to ease away rather than cut parent role completely

-- Transition parents as well as students

-- IEP must be written on front of transcript (SED regulations)

-- If local college decision to admit (and serve) non-high school diploma people, then ability to benefit becomes a factor

Recommended Resource: Laubach Literacy Catalog

Gene M. Winter
Reactor/Recorder

B. In terms of evaluation and assessment, what is most helpful to the college and how to best work with secondary levels to improve transition?

Facilitator: Kathy Hoffman
Coordinator
Erie C. C., South Campus

1. Strategies to facilitate exchange/response with secondary schools

a) Some colleges seek to serve students with learning disabilities and actively go into the schools to recruit.

b) Resource Room teachers and guidance counselors should be included on mailing lists. SETRC office will assist with contacts within the school systems to begin communicating about transitional programs. In urban locations with a larger pool of schools to work with, SETRC can provide a list of Resource Room Teachers.

c) Discussion is going on in Albany to discontinue psychological evaluations after the initial evaluation -- need to communicate that these students, especially "L.D." students, need continued psychological evaluations.

d) Some guidance counselors will have learning disabled students tour campuses.

e) Continue to request psychological evaluations, I.E. Plan and talk to students and the teachers who have worked with these students to help decisions about appropriate accommodations based on skill level.

f) Request that SED promote, with school psychologists, consistent system regarding testing of students with learning disabilities.

g) A case needs to be built to substantiate if a student should be allowed to waive a class, depending on course content and its relevance to the overall program. Problems occur when students say they want or need a waiver for a certain class, and the documentation may not be strong enough to assist in determining that a waiver is needed. An Advisory Committee can be useful as well as outside agencies, institutions and professionals to assist documentation.

h) There are basic skills, such as decision-making, that all students, including students with disabilities, should have. All schools have the right to define what they expect and require in order that students receive L.D. services.

i) Occupational programs should put in writing what is required of students, such as certain levels of competency required in EMT, Paramedic and Nursing programs.

j) Admissions Directors and staff should be aware how to read the differences in high school transcripts to determine if it is a "regular high school diploma".

k) Incoming students need self-advocacy skills, social skills negotiating and common courtesy skills. There should be a bridge program prior to college to make this transition occur.

l) Send present and former students to former high schools to share what it means to be a college student and its demands. Instead of giving tours try shadowing in the same programs that potential students are interested.

m) Have a physically disabled student give a tour or shadow another student who may have that same disability (wheelchair users, crutches, visually impaired students).

n) Try to address faculty individually instead of in division meetings, unless your college has smaller numbers of faculty.

o) College days at a community college

-- Talk about requirements for 4-yr and 2-yr schools

-- Talk about student responsibilities and expectations

-- Explain Section 504 law and have a student panel speak

2. <u>What are our needs from VESID for evaluation and vocational assessment</u>?

a) Reasoning/Abstract Thinking Skills

-- Inference skills - WAIS-R subtest skills -- data that reflects where a student began and where they currently are relative to their skills (where change has occurred)

-- Social skills - appropriate skills

-- Learning styles - written, oral, verbal directions; reading skills, notetaking skills, following directions; how does this student take in information?

-- Mechanical/Fine Motor Skills

-- Computer literacy skills - writing assignments, and using the computer } Adaptive Equipment Needs

-- Math/Science - fractions, operate calculator; communication skills - to talk to people. Articulation skills } Self Advocacy Skills

-- Career interest - reality and basic skills that are required for these programs

-- Writing, typing, Braille skills

3. <u>Needs/Recommendations</u>

-- A Minute-Manual on tests used by school psychologists in the school systems

-- A consortium of colleges in an area offer a week-long program on a (college) campus to address various topics regarding transition for several students who may be going to different schools, but are all entering the colleges for the first time (which could be paid by VESID)

-- Metacognitive skills in conjunction with a 3-credit course like general psychology; with someone other than the primary teacher to do the section on Metacognitive skills

-- Resource teachers encouraging students to take homework home; begin to work using tape recorders, notetaker, and/-or other skills

4. Resources: Schurer & Telper. "Unlocking Potentials," Publisher -- Adler & Adler (checklist for LD students' skills)

Gail Williams
Reactor/Recorder

C. Designation of secondary and postsecondary roles and workable strategies in facilitating transition

Facilitator: Sandra Arnone
SETRC Representative
Rensselaer-Columbia-Greene BOCES

Discussion

Secondary and postsecondary institutions have their own activities but there is a void that transition needs to fill. Secondary institutions have built-in systems but postsecondary need more resources to meet needs of learning disabled students as they emerge. Learning disabled students are choosing two-year colleges because of easier transition. Further, the learning disabled label is now acceptable, middle class parents/students will accept the label even when that condition may not exist because it means services and accommodations. Potential students and parents may require "training" and understandings of themselves and agencies such as VESID. (Recommended aid - Unlocking Potential, AHSSPPE publication). The key players in transition include students, parents, guidance personnel, resource room and mainstream teachers, college faculty and community agencies such as VESID. The role of SETRC is dissemination of information, instruction to teachers and parents, providing local needs assessments/contacts and assisting children (under 21) into mainstream education. Liberty Partnerships are support programs at the secondary/middle school level.

Concerns

1. Clear understanding of the concept of transition
2. The void in transition from secondary to postsecondary levels
3. An overload on postsecondary resources; no "built-ins" as at the secondary level
4. Better preparation of learning disabled students at the secondary level -- understanding self-advocacy skills, knowledge of various supportive laws, and time management/organizational/study skills (Project Bridge).
5. "Quality" of shared information between secondary and postsecondary
6. Learning disabled students do not "identify" themselves at the postsecondary level.
7. "Fear" at the secondary level of information requests
8. Because learning disabled label is now "acceptable," some learning disabled are not really learning disabled; parents want the services for their children
9. Better training across the board for all involved parties
10. Dispel unknowns for students/parents

11. Academic potential/IEP-- Is academic potential present with IEP diploma; need to understand factors through better communication

What would help postsecondary level?

a) Dispel "concern" that information being requested from secondary level will be used as examples of lack of provision at high school level

b) Assistance with "deciphering" high school transcripts

c) Postsecondary personnel must work to build bridges with secondary personnel - "public relations work" - to address:

   a) Specialized orientations

   b) Peer linkages

   c) Campus visits

   d) Give high school chance to share information, "respect their expertise"

   e) Vocational person for students with disabilities

   f) Remove suspicions held by secondary through face-to-face contact, tone of letters/phone calls and clarity in what is requested

   g) Change the role of the school psychologist - prioritize amount of testing needed on individual in order to "free up" psychologist to be more involved in transition activities

Recommendations

-- Identify key personnel - students, parents, guidance, resource room person, mainstream teacher, community resources, VESID, college staff/faculty

-- Better communication

-- Use of community resources/programs, i.e., Project Bridge (Kathy Hoffman, Debbie Knight), Liberty Partnership, others

-- Remove suspicions, respect expertise, professional "tone" -- it's for the student's best interest

-- Review/enlarge roles of personnel involved

-- Better understanding/interpretation of IEPs transcripts, school records

-- Campus visits, workshops, specialized orientation -- involve counselor/secondary personnel in special orientation, student admitted if counselor attends

VESID Role in Transition

a) Wide variation of "involvement/success" by individual VESID staff and counselors

b) Incentives to local VESID offices for updates/training

c) Concerns regarding "trial semesters" - don't sponsor when most needed

d) Concerns regarding VESID "regulations versus institutional regulations" as latter may still allow student to continue

Suggestions to Facilitate Role

-- Better communication!

-- Workshops with staff regarding college

-- Inservice programs now for VESID managers

-- VESID changes are occurring!

Bruce Pomeroy
Reactor/Recorder

TOPIC: USE AND VALIDITY OF STANDARDIZED TESTS WITH LD STUDENTS

Presenter: Richard M. Clark, Professor
University at Albany
State University of New York

A. Standardized testing provides information on one of two types of performance: Maximum or Typical Performance --

1. Maximum Performance (untimed)

Provide time needed to do best, so use of alternative testing procedures that involve more time presents no problem

2. Typical Performance (timed)

Incorporates speed into the measure, or how fast can one do something? If alternative testing procedures involve more time, the problem becomes: is the outcome or information useful if it takes twice as long to perform the task?

Best predictor of college success: High school grades

B. Reliability - consistency of measure but also within person - may not be related to assessment but to individual if "up and down."

C. Validity - Does it measure what it's supposed to? Predictive validity is most usually used. Why use SAT? adds information maybe -- how does one account for:
high high school performance - low SAT
low high school performance - high SAT

D. Testing Learning Disabled Students - What is real nature of disability? standard guess relates deficit to processing information somehow --

How can you find out about a disability if student can't read standardized test? --

Suggestion -

Use 3 or 4 back-up test manuals that discuss components of test.

Example: assume a national norm of 4 for a test component labeled literal comprehension and a LD student scores 4, but shows no ability for inference (5 is national norm, student scores 0). One may then use a specific test of logic, or determine what does instructor do for which student must draw inference, or is what's being tested a class requirement? Given this, one should be able to match assessment to required tasks in curricula.

Validity is tougher when farther away/remote from outcome. Test should be related to outcome.

F. Social issue - how many try and do not succeed? What is consequence of not trying versus trying?

GENERAL REQUESTS TO STATE LEVEL AGENCIES

The closing activity of the meeting was a general discussion which included a recommendation that participants' requests be considered by agencies involved with learning disabled students. The requests were viewed as important to facilitate the delivery of appropriate services and support locally which, in turn, results in increased student success.

1) There should be increased opportunities for front-line staff to be involved in some way with State Education Department/VESID and other agencies in order to develop greater understandings between field concerns and policy level concerns.

2) Participants felt the need for more support and information from SUNY Central Administration. Top administrators also need information and support from SUNY and/or State Education Department. Two-way communication is needed between field and decision-makers.

3) State Education Department should promote standardizing of information received from secondary level, or provide more direction for insuring commonalities. For example, the IEP designation is not appearing on transcripts.

4) There is a continual need for consultation opportunities on legal questions.

5) A compilation and sharing of "best practices" reports and better communication across agencies would be useful for all.

6) A suggestion was made that VESID set-up technology centers on a regional basis - "equipment closets," i.e., 6 Braille printers to share, return and buy other equipment as appropriate.

APPENDIX A

Office for the Disabled

Hudson Valley Community College

Campus Center Room 100
80 Vandenburgh Avenue • Troy, New York 12180
(518) 270-7154

DISABLED STUDENT SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR TAPING LECTURES

HUDSON VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

In the "Rules and Regulations" outlining procedures for compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap), it is stated, in the HEW Regulations, § 84. 44 (B), "a recipient to which this subpart applies (HVCC) may not impose upon handicapped students . . . rules such as the prohibition of tape recorders (or braillers) in classrooms . . . that have the effect of limiting the participation of handicapped students in the recipient's (HVCC) education program of activity."

Some professors may later want to copyright lectures and therefore are concerned about allowing students to tape record their lectures. This problem can be solved by the student's completing the following agreement:

I, _____, agree that I will not

release the tape recordings or transcription or otherwise hinder _____
professor's

_____ ability to obtain a copyright on
name

lectures I have taped in _____
Department, Course Number, and Title

_____

_____ _____
Date Student Signature

This form is submitted to the instructor/professor upon completion.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON D.C. 20202

FACT SHEET

FAMILY EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS AND PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

(FERPA)

The FERPA is a Federal law designed to protect the privacy of a student's education records. The law applies to all schools which receive funds under an applicable program from the U.S. Department of Education.

The FERPA gives certain rights to parents regarding their children's education records. These rights transfer to the student or former student who has reached the age of 18 or is attending any school beyond the high school level. Students and former students to whom the rights have transferred are called eligible students.

-- Parents or eligible students have the right to inspect and review all of the student's education records maintained by the school. Schools are not required to provide copies of materials in education records unless, for reasons such as great distance, it is impossible for parents or eligible students to inspect the records personally. The school may charge a fee for copies.

-- Parents and eligible students have the right to request that a school correct records believed to be inaccurate or misleading. If the school refuses to change the records, the parent or eligible student then has the right to a formal hearing. After the hearing, if the school still refuses the correction, the parent or eligible student has the right to place a statement in the records commenting on the contested information in the records.

-- Generally, the school must have written permission from the parent or eligible student before releasing any information from a student's record. However, the law allows schools to disclose records, without consent, to the following parties:

. School employees who have a need-to-know;
. Other schools to which a student is transferring;
. Parents when a student over 18 is still dependent;
. Certain government officials in order to carry out lawful functions;
. Appropriate parties in connection with financial aid to a student;
. Organizations doing certain studies for the school;
. Accrediting organizations;
. Individuals who have obtained court orders or subpoenas;
. Persons who need to know in cases of health and safety emergencies;
. State and local authorities to whom disclosure is required by state laws adopted before November 19, 1974

Schools may also disclose, without consent, "directory" type information such as a student's name, address, telephone number, date and place of birth, honors and awards, and dates of attendance. However, the school must tell parents and students of the information that is designated as directory information and provide a reasonable amount of time to allow the parent or eligible student to request the school not to disclose that information about them.

Schools must notify parents and eligible students of their rights under this law. The actual means of notification (special letter, inclusion in a PTA bulletin, student handbook, or newspaper article) is left to each school.

Schools must adopt a written policy about complying with the FERPA. Schools must give the parent or eligible student a copy of the policy, on request.

If you wish to see your child's education records, or if you are over 18 or are attending college and would like to see your records, you should contact the school for the procedure to follow.

If you have any questions about the FERPA, or if you have problems in securing your rights under this Act, you may call (202) 732-2057 or write to: Family Policy and Regulations Office, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 3021, Washington, DC 20202.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges NOV 2 2 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE